

*Statement on Proposed Revision
Without Pay Policy, Prepared by the Federal Women's
Program Board.*

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director of Central Intelligence

FROM: ~~Federal Women's Program~~

SUBJECT: ~~Proposed Revised Leave Without Pay Policy~~ *in of*

REFERENCE:

1. The Leave Without Pay (LWOP) policy is a matter of great concern to CIA women because historically the woman has been the spouse to accept this status when an Agency-employed couple is transferred abroad. The employee on LWOP status was ^{often} able to sign a contract for employment with the Agency station or base to which the husband was transferred, while maintaining a certain amount of retirement and other benefits. *and the following comments* (Please note that these words are not limited to DDO but apply to all Agency personnel.)

Upon unanimous vote,
2. The Federal Women's Program Board (FWPB) recommends that the current proposal to limit LWOP to a 90-day period not be accepted because it will exacerbate the current problems of the Clandestine Service (CS). We strongly endorse the commitment to reemployment but we cannot accept guarantees of reemployment upon return Stateside that are restricted by qualifications, the accuracy of which the unemployed spouse will find difficult to determine.

3. The FWPB believes that the LWOP policy should be maintained and strengthened through more equitable application and the establishment of revised procedures to improve its effectiveness.

Suggested is a statistical study to determine the number of employees on LWOP, the cost of maintaining them in this status, and the number of employees lost to overseas service through loss of mobility or even termination of service as the result of the loss of spouse income.

4. The ^{CS}problems were identified by DDO's former Personnel Chief, Thomas Polgar in his memorandum to the DDO of 9 April 1979 (copy attached). Mr. Polgar in his "suggestions on how to turn around the trends impacting on the morale and longer-term effectiveness of the Clandestine Service" pointed out that:

The DCI and other senior officials should state (and act as if they believed it) that personnel under cover and committed to frequent changes of residence face problems which are psychologically and financially different from the rest of CIA, and that such personnel require care and attention ...

He says that "Mobility ... at all levels ... must be assured." Having a negative impact on this mobility, he continues, are the following trends:

The devaluation of the dollar against several foreign currencies is a fact of life. There is nothing the US Government or CIA can do to return us all to the good old days in Europe and the Far East when the dollar was king. US government employees, unless they have a substantial private income, are not going to be seen with their families in the choicer watering spots, ski resorts, or even the middle-class Holiday Inn or Sheraton Hotels abroad...

He identifies the unfavorable impact on family mobility that a lack of employment for the spouse will incur:

There is no way in which the Government could compensate for the loss of spouse income which is almost inevitable when the family is transferred outside the US ... (There can be) no meaningful answer to the professionally trained spouse whose interests are outside the Government."

He argues that:

These realities must be faced and dealt with if we are interested in the continuation of a healthy, vigorous, competitive clandestine service. It is not merely a question whether we are going to get people with the motivation and qualifications for service abroad, but a question of the willingness of the type of person we need to accept a career of second-class, or worse, existence for self and family ...

You get what you pay for applies also to CIA.

The amounts required to upgrade the attractiveness of the Service abroad are so miniscule in the national scale of things that they can be opposed seriously only as a matter of principle or of politics, not as a matter of financial economy.*

The recent study done by the NAPA team argues that the LWOP policy should be strengthened, as follows:

"Set up better mechanisms to guarantee that those ... who are returning from ... LWOP, will be retained through having absolute priority on all vacancies."
(NAPA, Conclusions, p. 99)

Placement of employee spouses returning from LWOP during an overseas assignment has not been afforded a sufficiently high priority. (NAPA Executive Summary, p. VII)

FWP13
5. Arguments to support this LWOP policy are as follows:

Helps to Maintain the Attractiveness of CIA Service

Today when service as a CIA officer holds particular risk in service abroad -- beyond that of any other foreign service

*See LWOP Benefits, p.5.

agency, as indicated by press reports of propaganda from around the world -- benefits and supporting measures for the career officer and the spouse should be increased, not taken away.

(Unless the CIA accepts the US State Department dependent's suggestion for a service of bachelors.) The FWPB believes that unless the service remains attractive to married career officers, the Clandestine Service will neither attract nor hold the maximum number of top calibre employees but rather will be forced to complete its ranks with relatively less able employees -- whose willingness to serve ^{abroad} is strengthened by the fact that their options elsewhere are limited.

Helps to Maintain the Mobility of Career Officers

The LWOP policy helps to insure a survival level of family income at a time when many CIA employees/families are questioning whether they can afford to serve overseas because of:

- the shrinking value of the US dollar
- elimination of many ^{per}quisites formerly provided
- losses of personal possessions through loss and damage in shipping and theft by servants
- medical expenses for illnesses incurred abroad that must be treated at personal expense after return Stateside
- the nonreimbursible expenses of entertainment

Helps to Maintain a Pool of Available Employees with Skills and Experience Appropriate to the Overseas Mission

Many of these employees -- although classified as clericals

and assigned to jobs at entry levels -- have had many weeks of training and years of experience in skills essential to the CIA mission, such as recordkeeping, security procedures such as pouching, communication, and preparation of the specialized formats required to process field reports expeditiously through the computerized message system.

Provides Convenience to the Station

The spouse is available at the convenience of the station to take part-time, intermittent, or temporary assignments, as well as fulltime employment. She frequently can be employed with a minimum of delay ^{because} ~~by avoiding~~ the long clearance period ^{the length of time for clearance is} (average ^{one year}, even for employees who have already had clearances but have had a break in service) ^{because they must wait their turn.} and, because she is already at post, the delay of travel time is eliminated.

LWOP Benefits Are Earned

The spouse traditionally has served without recognition or recompense in a variety of roles: typist, reports clerk, caterer, chauffeur, hostess, operations support assistant, as well as aiding the staff officer with cover, assessment, and contacts. At the time when LWOP is being abolished (for all practical purposes) because -- according to one argument -- spouses having this status are earning retirement and insurance benefits (that are expensive to the Agency) while "unemployed," a training course is now being offered to case officers' wives so that they can be used for such direct operational assignments, as assessments, surveillance, and contacts. It would seem that the benefits that the LWOP spouse accrues are -- to some extent,

at least -- earned.

Balancing Costs

Costs of maintaining 60 spouses currently on LWOP status* (who earn some insurance and retirement benefits) should be balanced against the following costs:

- approximately \$10,000 that it costs to clear a potential employee

- savings in transportation, processing, and other logistics costs when two employees are sent out as a working couple

- a strong guarantee that the expensively trained career officer will remain mobile ^{and} with the Agency

*figure currently quoted, but unsource^d.